Affairs Notification G.S.R. No. 52 (E), dated the 24th January, 1989, publishing the Arms (Amendment) Rules, 1989 [Placed in Library. *See* No. LT-7715/89]

Report and Accounts (1987-88) of the Birds Jute and Exports Limited Calcutta and related papers

SHRI M.M. JACOB: Madam, on behalf of SHRI RAFIQUE ALAM I beg to lay on the Table a copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following papers:—

(i) Annual Report and Accounts of the Birds Jute and Exports Limited, Calcutta, for the year 1987-88, together with the Auditors' Report on the Accounts.

(ii) Review by Government on the working of the Company.

(iii) Statement giving reasons for the delay in laying the papers mentioned at (i) above.

[Placed in Library. *See* No. LT-7683/89 for (i) to (iii).]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Miss Saroj Khaparde is laying her own papers.

Report and Accounts (1986) of the Lala Ram Sarup Tuberculosis Hospital, New Delhi and related papers.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (KUMARI SAROJ KHAPARDE): Madam, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following papers:—

(i) Annual Report and Accounts of the Lala Ram Sarup Tuberculosis Hospital, New Delhi, for the year 1986, together with the Auditors' Report on the Accounts.

(ii) Review by Government on the working of the Hospital.

(iii) Statement giving reasons for the delay in laying the papers mentioned at (i) above.

[Placed in Library *See* No. LT-7693/89 for (i) to (iii).]

STATMENT BY MINISTER

Withdrawal of Money from Contingency Fund of India for Depositing in Delhi High Court in compliance with its order

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV): Madam, An advance of Rs. 47,73,000/- is being sought from the Contingency Fund for depositing in the Delhi High Court by 9th April, 1989 in compliance with its order dated 30th January, 1989 passed in Execution Case No. 158/88 "Abdul Wahid & Others -*Vs*- Union of India". No provision could be made for this unforeseen Charged expenditure in the Budget under "Demand No. 44" and it was too late for inclusion in the last batch of Supplementary Demand for the year 1988-89.

The Delhi High Court decided the case